

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,392	04/19/2004	Jonah Staw	61145.129	3113
27128 7590 03/12/2010 HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS LLP 190 Carondelet Plaza			EXAMINER	
			ZURITA, JAMES H	
Suite 600 ST, LOUIS, MO 63105		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/12/2010	EI ECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pto-sl@huschblackwell.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/827,392	STAW ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAMES ZURITA	3625	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. \(\times \) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the polition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee nave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension is under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort in (a) show, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
AMENDMENTS
 ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☒ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or mended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is for will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1.3-6.8.9.11-13.15-18 and 24-43</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>21-23</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. \(\subseteq \) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the disclosures do not mention a computer, and raise the issue of new matter
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.
Homes Zwits Homes Zwits Driver- Francisco
/James Zurita/ James Zurita, Primary Examiner

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 13. Other: After further review, the indicated allowability of claims 1,3-6,8,9,11-13,15-18 and 24-43 is withdrawn because the claims are dinceted to non-statutory subject matter. The claims fail the mechine-or-transformation test: Based on Supreme Court precedence see Diamond v Diehr 450 US 175,184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 US 584,588.n. 9 (1978); Gottschalk v Berson, 49 US 58,7 (1972); Cochtane v Deener, 94 US 780, 787-88 (1876) a 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as an apparatus) or transform underlying subject mater (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. Since neither of these requirements is met by the claim the claim is rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject mater. Applicants disclosures do not mention a computer. Further, mere placement of different design features on an item is not a non-trivial transformation.